

0

T

P
BX
612 rub
T6B

Chur of England 570
PUBLISHED

CORRESPONDENCE AND PAPERS

CALLED FORTH BY A CANVASS AMONG A SECTION OF THE

CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO,

HAVING IN VIEW

THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE VENERABLE

THE ARCHDEACON OF YORK,

IN SAID DIOCESE,

AS THE INCUMBENT OF THE PROPOSED

NEW BISHOPRIC OF KINGSTON,

CANADA WEST.

P
BX
612
T6B

*Published originally in the "Echo and Protestant Episcopal Recorder" newspaper,
Port Hope, Canada West.*

PRINTED AT THE DAILY NEWS STEAM PRESS.

1854.

LP

BX5612. T6B



EGG



*Purchased for the Lorne Pierce Collection
at Queen's University on the
Edith Chown Pierce Trust*

The Lord Bishop of Toronto convened an Assembly or Synod of the Church in the Diocese of Toronto, on the 12th October, 1853, to take into consideration important matters connected with the Church in Canada West. The Synod was composed of the Bishop, the Clergy of the Diocese, and one or two lay delegates from each church or mission. Among the subjects brought under the notice of the Synod, was the contemplated division of the extensive Diocese of Toronto. "An attempt was made to get a declaration from that Synod, recommending the filling up of the proposed new Sees from among the clergy resident in them; the resolution being submitted to a preparatory committee, and brought forward by them, was almost unanimously expunged." Thus the matter was left by the Synod entirely in the hands of the authorities of the Parent Church in England, for (in the words of the Rev. Mr Townley) "So long as the colonies have not the right of electing their Bishops formally conceded to them, to attempt to do so is both *premature* and *undignified*; and until we ourselves have made provision for securing suitable incomes for our Bishops, it is unseemly, to say the least, to strive to take the appointment out of the hands of those whose benevolent zeal we shall probably have to be indebted to for that boon also, in addition to our past innumerable obligations."

Since the meeting and decision of the Synod, it has transpired that a canvass is being made among a section of the clergy of the diocese, with the view of memorializing the authorities of the Church in England, recommending the Venerable A. N. BETHUNE, D.D., Archdeacon of York, in the diocese of Toronto, as a fit and suitable candidate for consecration to the proposed See of Kingston.

The following correspondence and papers, called forth by such canvass, are submitted to the prayerful consideration of those who feel interested in a matter of so much moment to the

welfare of the Church of England and Ireland—the appointment of a Bishop to the proposed Diocese of Kingston.

Extract from the Proceedings of Synod relative to the Report of the Preparatory Committee on the Division of the Diocese, as published.

“The 1st clause recommended the formation of two additional sees; one east, and the other west, of the then remaining Diocese of Toronto. The second clause (which was ultimately expunged) proposed that the selection for the increased Episcopate should be made from the clergy of the diocese. The 3d clause provided for the establishment of an Episcopal Fund. The 4th clause embodied a request to the Lord Bishop of Toronto to renew his exertions for the immediate division of the Diocese.”

Letter of Rev. S. B. Ardagh, A.M., Rector of the Town of Burrie, C.W.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ECHO.

Nov. 24, 1853.

REV. SIR,—

A “Circular” having been forwarded to me, dated Grafton Parsonage, Nov. 2nd, and signed J. Wilson, “on behalf of the venerable the Archdeacon of York, as the man of *all others best qualified* to fill the proposed See (Kingston.) If long and grateful services, combined with untiring devotion to the interests of the Church, and an intimate knowledge of her peculiar wants, can give a man a title to promotion, then are the Archdeacon’s claims paramount and irresistible.” Mr. Wilson goes on to say, “under these circumstances, it is proposed to form a Committee for the purpose of obtaining the votes of such of the Clergy as are favourable to the Archdeacon’s nomination. A memorial to be submitted to this Committee to be signed by all

those favourable to such a movement, and forwarded to Her Majesty's Government in England."

Now, sir, I might ask whether Mr. Wilson occupies that position in the Diocese which would warrant him in taking such a prominent part as to the filling up the proposed Bishopric, and thus giving his opinion of Dr. Bethune. However, although but an humble Minister in the Diocese, I feel bound to express my opinion, and to demur to that of Mr. Wilson as to the Archdeacon's qualifications for that very responsible office. I do so on public grounds, (the Archdeacon having been brought forward publicly as a candidate, I am to suppose with his own consent,) and with profession of the utmost personal respect to the Archdeacon. Amongst the many qualifications that should distinguish a Bishop, especially at a time when our unhappy divisions are so rife, I shall mention but two which in my humble judgment should be prominent. 1st, an absence of extreme doctrinal views; and 2nd, a character which has been marked, after a lengthened period, by great prudence. Now I conceive that the Archdeacon is deficient in both these points. For a proof of the first, I refer you to a file of the *Church* paper, while under the Editorship of Dr. Bethune, especially his opinions on the principles of Drs. Newman, Pusey, (I put Newman first, as the honestest man) et hoc genus omne. For the proof of the second, I refer to his conduct as Principal of the late Theological Institution at Cobourg, when by his imprudent zeal in forcing his views upon the students, he drove three of them away, who, being promising young men, were well nigh lost to the ministry of our Church.

Now we may ask "If these things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" If these things were done in a comparatively inferior position, what may we expect from him when placed in the almost irresponsible position of Bishop?

I beg to assure Mr Wilson that this opinion is held by a much greater and more influential number than he supposes. If Mr Wilson and his friends persist in canvassing for names to a memorial, let them be prepared for a counter document being forwarded to the same quarter.

As I feel that no man ought to shrink when he considers that the Church is in danger—and the battle of principle is too noble to be fought from behind stone walls or paper screens—I think it right to subscribe myself openly and honestly.

S. B. ARDAGH,

Rector of Barrie, in the Diocese of Toronto.

*Letter of Rev. R. V. Rogers, Incumbent of St. James' Church,
in the City of Kingston, C. W.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ECHO.

ST. JAMES', KINGSTON,
December 1, 1853.

DEAR SIR: Agreeing as I do with my friend and brother, the Rector of Barrie, on the subject of the elevation of Dr Bethune to the Bishop's chair, let me advise that, without any loss of time, a respectful yet firm memorial be forwarded to the Archbishop of Canterbury, praying that no such affliction be suffered to fall on our struggling church in this Province as the appointment of one so distasteful to those that are without, and possessing so little of the confidence of those within our communion.

As a long resident in the Archdeaconry, and consequently acquainted with the public sentiment respecting our Church, I am persuaded that the appointment, not only of Dr. Bethune, but of any man of his extreme views would greatly paralyze, if not destroy, our Church. Protestantism is too much aroused to tolerate any who sympathize with semi-Popery.

Permit me to suggest a still further step, that they whose views agree, in the main, with the *Echo*, both Laity and Clergy, should at once send home an expression of their opinion. Hitherto we have kept silence, and our silence has been construed into indifference. There is a point beyond which humility becomes degradation and caution cowardice. I think we have arrived at that point.

Towards Dr. B. as *a man* I desire to entertain the kindest feelings; but Dr. B. in his public character, I regret to say, has not my sympathy, and can have none of my support.

With earnest prayer, that the great HEAD over all things to His Church, may graciously look on us, and send us a man after His own heart—and suggesting that prayer without ceasing be made to God for this.

Believe me, Yours and the Church's servant,

For CHRIST's sake,

R. V. ROGERS.

P.S. I have not received any circular from Mr. Wilson.

Letter of the Ven. A. N. Bethune, D.D., Archdeacon of York.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ECHO.

SIR,—I have incidentally seen the *Echo* of the 6th instant.

The occupation of the future See of Kingston is to me, personally, a matter probably of more indifference than it is to the Rev. R. V. Rogers, or to the others who, with an indelicacy and impropriety I believe without a parallel, are publicly canvassing the merits of an individual in reference to that high office.

I suppose that, with this vicious precedent, we shall, in the future Diocese of Kingston, have a public canvassing of the qualifications of Clergymen who may be named as candidates for vacant Rectories. The one would be just as fair, and wise, and decent as the other.

But what I am concerned to notice in the communication of Mr. Rogers is his assertion that I am of the number of those who "sympathize with semi-Popery." I defy him, or you, or any man, to prove this; or that I have taught or preached any doctrine not in accordance with the tenets of the Church of England; or that, as a conscientious member of that Church, I entertain or advocate "extreme views of doctrine."

That Mr. Rogers should withhold his confidence or support from me on any occasion, will not generally be regarded of as much importance as he himself appears to attach to the fact. But I desire that he should be guided by simple charity, and utter nothing but credible statements. In this case, the apparent earnestness of petition which closes his communication would be regarded as something better than a solemn mockery.

The reiteration of such attacks as the *Echo* now contains, will enable its supporters to congratulate themselves,—if such be a subject for congratulation,—upon reviving the spirit of religious party which was fast dying away in this Diocese. While the resuscitation of this unhappy spirit will not by any means impede the advance of Popery, it will accelerate that, which is in fact, the ulterior tendency of the crusade against the Clergy Reserves, so faintly condemned in the *Echo*,—the spread of rationalism and infidelity.

I am, Sir, your obd't servant,

A. N. BETHUNE,

Archdeacon of York.

Cobourg, Dec. 13, 1853.

Reply of Rev. R. V. Rogers.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ECHO.

ST. JAMES', KINGSTON,
December 22, 1853.

DEAR SIR,—However indifferent “the occupation of the future See of Kingston” may be to the Venerable the Archdeacon of York, it is otherwise to me. Ought it to be a matter of indifference to any, whether of our church or not, considering what consequences, for time and eternity, are involved in the character of the occupant?

I am really at a loss to discover the “*indelicacy and impropriety of publicly canvassing the merits of an individual in reference to that high office.*” Has not that individual been introduced to our notice, and his peculiar claims pressed on our consideration by a circular, sent, I should suppose, not altogether without the knowledge of Dr. Bethune?

It seems to me that “the indelicacy and impropriety of publicly canvassing, &c.” *has a parallel*, at least in the indelicacy and impropriety of the gentleman whose name is subscribed to the circular. In the latter case the decision of the Synod seems to have been contradicted,—that the incumbent of the Bishopric of Kingston should not be selected from among the Canadian clergy. If thus, as Dr. Bethune thinks, “the precedent be vicious,” the fault is with the friends of the Archdeacon. The opposite has only followed, when they had led the way. Indeed we were taken by surprise, and the secret manner in which the wishes of the party were to have been consummated savors little of that honesty which should ever characterize the doings of Christians. If then, in my former letter, I expressed myself strongly, it was because I felt strongly—not from any desire to give offence.

I quite agree with Mr. Archdeacon Bethune, that that which concerns him is my charge of his being of those who sympathized with semi-Popery; and it equally concerns me. Little as Dr. Bethune values my confidence—doubtless, because my influence is little—yet he knows that I am responsible to God, and the congregation over which I am placed, for that little: and surely, Dr. B. would not wish me to act contrary to my conviction, even though in so doing, I have to place myself in antagonism to his friends:—God being my helper, no considerations of personal consequences shall induce me to fail in

my duty as a "watchman" in the Church of God. Let me tell Dr. Bethune, with all respect to his official station, yet with all plainness, that I hope my apparent earnestness is "*something better than a solemn mockery*;" though, by his language, it would seem as if he half questioned it. Well, God knoweth our hearts; and to Him I will refer the matter. In what I may say, I desire to be "guided by charity," and to utter nothing but "credible statements."

As to the amount of credit to be given to my evidence that Dr. Bethune sympathises with *Tractarianism*, that which I call semi-Popery, I shall cite as witness, the Rev. A. N. Bethune, Editor of the *Church*; and as I believe those views have never been repudiated, I may consider them as the opinions of the Archdeacon of York.

Let me endeavor to show—

1st. That Mr. Bethune's extracts, as Editor of the *Church*, were made chiefly from Books, Pamphlets and Sermons of that School.

2nd. That Mr. Bethune's editorials, when referring to these topics, approved of these views, considering them, exclusively, as the views of the Church of England and Ireland; and that he condemned all others as "wicked and schismatical."

In relation to the first point, for proof I must refer to the *Church*, whilst the second time under his editorship. As to the second, I can only refer your readers to a few out of the many proofs before me.

It is well known that the *London Record* has been ever the special object of attack with those who have introduced "the novelties" which have so sadly "disturbed the peace of our Church." It may not be so well known that the *Churchman's Newspaper* is a decided advocate of these. On an article in the *Record*, condemnatory of the Altar, Credence-table, Piscina, Sedilia, and Pulpit, all of stone, set up in a new church at Jedburgh in Scotland, the *Churchman's Newspaper* writes most severely of its cotemporary. Having introduced this article, after speaking in the most laudatory terms of the *Churchman's Newspaper*, the Editor of the *Church*, Oct., 1844, concludes—"That the *Churchman's Newspaper* may, from its extensive, and we will hope, general diffusion amongst the sound-hearted members of our communion, prove an effectual antidote to what we must call the wicked principles of the *Record*, is our most sincere wish." I would remark—here are two exponents of views, doctrinal and ecclesiastical, directly opposed to each

other ; and here is Mr. Bethune's "most sincere wish" for the "general diffusion" of the *Churchman's Newspaper*, as an "effectual antidote to the wicked principles of the *Record*:" and yet Dr. Bethune defies me or you, or any man, to prove that "I entertain or advocate extreme views of doctrine."

All have heard of the *Oxford Tracts*. All are aware of their effects on the Church of England. All are aware of the present position of many of their authors. All who have carried out these positions to their legitimate conclusions are safely within the bosom of that apostacy, whose principles and practices they were even then adopting and advocating whilst professed members and ministers of our Protestant Church. It is further well known that the opinions respecting these Tracts mark the school of Theology to which the individual holding them belongs. Dr. Bethune, as editor, albut ever speaks tenderly of them ; often in praise ; and, when compelled to condemn, condemns so gently, and in such soothing terms, as albut amounts to justification. June 15, 1839, there appears on the first page of the *Church* an article on these Tracts, of a highly laudatory character as a whole, but unaccompanied by a single word of qualification or caution from the editor. In an editorial of October 19, 1839, too long for insertion here, Dr. Bethune, in reply to a correspondent, speaks in the most favorable terms of the Oxford Tracts. Amongst other things, he says :

"From whatsoever cause, whether from real concern for the truth which was thought to be in jeopardy, or from the impulse of party jealousy, & very unfair construction has frequently been placed upon the sentiments and tendency of the Oxford Tracts."

With reference to the opposition made to their teaching, he has these words :

"This vehemence of polemical assault—this apparent desire to sweep away with the besom of wrath, and without the condescension of an impartial trial, these emanations from some of the most distinguished divines of a Protestant and learned University—was calculated to awaken the antecedent impression that there was more of zeal than judgment, more of warmth than justice, in the denunciations which were promulgated against them."

Of the opposers of the Tracts, he says :

"We know that in many—perhaps a majority of instances—this condemnation of the imputed errors of the Oxford Tracts emanated from individuals who were the merest tyron in theological learning ;

who had scarcely read a line in *Ecclesiastical History* or a chapter upon Church Antiquities, beyond what is presented, meagre and second-hand, in the elementary books furnished to the youngest students in Divinity! * * * * *

We have not merely received with distrust the floating accusations against the heretical tendency of the *Tracts for the Times*, but we have been led to believe that, if fairly weighed and honestly examined, they would be found to contain more truth than error, more that the consistent member of our National and Apostolical Church should be thankful for than condemn.

"One advantage—a blessing we shall not hesitate to call it—the writers of the *Tracts for the Times* have we believe been mainly instrumental in achieving,—and that is, a better understanding of the real claims of the Church, and a clearer perception amongst its hitherto too careless and ill-informed members, of the real and Scriptural nature of that Apostolical commission, upon the maintenance of which in its integrity, the unity, and we must believe the prosperity, of the Church so mainly and essentially depends. * * To the Romish Church, the writers of the *Tracts for the Times* have, with the candor of truth, conceded the merit of retaining that principle of unity, to which Protestant Christians are lamentably indifferent, or which they are sinfully surrendering. To 'look upon the Church as one whole, one ordinance of God, as a house of God's building, as the witness of the truth to the whole world, and the keeper of the Sacraments,'—this is the vantage-ground which the Papistical Church, in its wiliness, has been careful not to surrender, but which the members of the true Catholic Church have in recklessly abandoning cast away the cement of their strength. * * To those who are desirous of learning in sincerity the merits of this controversy, we cannot offer a better recommendation than to procure and peruse the tracts for themselves. They may possibly be startled by some strange opinions; but the alarm in most instances, we believe, will prove to be one which a candid construction of their meaning, and the general bearing of their writings, will dispel: certain we are, at least, that they cannot fail to derive instruction and benefit from them as a whole."

Permit me to ask the Venerable the Archdeacon, whether he has ever availed himself of the many opportunities which his office has given him, of retracting any of those eulogies which he passed on these *Tracts*?

Aug. 24, 1839, in acknowledging the receipt of the two first parts of the "*Tracts for the Times*," Dr. B. writes:

"We hold ourselves indebted to the enterprising individual, be he who he may, who has placed these valuable and peculiar theological productions so closely within our reach.

"In giving so high a character, in general, to these Oxford publications, we beg most distinctly to be understood as not pledging ourselves to an unqualified approval of all that has emanated from those profound scholars and eminently pious men who have created such an excitement in the religious and even in the political world. The Oxford Tracts have an apparent tendency to some *few* doctrines which we deem erroneous, and which we believe are so held by the soundest of our Protestant divines; they are also occasionally disfigured by some expressions and sentiments which, to say the least, we consider of questionable lawfulness, and most decidedly inexpedient. Making, however, these deductions, we regard the champions of the Oxford Theology as men who have restored many a half-buried and forgotten truth to a prominence and importance to which they have too long been strangers. In aiming at the overthrow of modern Rationalism and Christian Laxity, they may have deviated a little too far from the middle and judicious course; but the imperfections into which we are of opinion they have fallen, are but the incrustations which enclose and surround the excavated ore, and which with a little attrition will speedily disappear—the labor of purification enhancing the value and the brilliancy of the metal called from darkness and inactivity to the lively use of man. When truth has been obscured, and even hidden, for a long time, it bursts upon us with a blaze almost dazzling; and it is not till we have become in some degree familiar with it that we can perceive its beauty, or admire the fulness of its effulgency. This is emphatically the case with many of the doctrines insisted on by the Oxford writers, and especially with that of the Apostolical Succession."

The clergy of that extreme school are they who Dr. Bethune delighted to honor, Rev. W. Gresley, Keble, Bishop Doane, etc.

March 28, 1840, an editorial eulogy is pronounced on "Perceval's Apology for the Apostolical Succession," in which it is decided, *ex cathedra*, that all they who do not hold the doctrine are "wayward," "thoughtless," and "ignorant." Strong language this from one who "does not entertain extreme views of doctrine!"

The Rev. W. Blunt had been charged before the Bishop of Exeter by his parishioners at Helston, and had been not only acquitted but approved of by his Bishop; though he introduced, without any authority, *novelties*, which may have been at one time *usages*, some of them when the Church was just emerging from the night of Popery, but which for centuries had become obsolete, and which have been restored by these Tractarians as emblems of that teaching which they are once again introducing into our Protestant Church. We find the editor of the

Church on January 10, 1845, thus remarking on the Bishop's document :

"The extracts we have given will be perused with interest, and we trust with satisfaction, by our readers generally ; and we cannot but feel a hope that, while they will serve to inform the minds of many who have not given any serious consideration to this subject, they will, at the same time, strengthen the hands of such of our clergy as, in obedience to the directions of our zealous Diocesan, are desirous of rendering our noble ritual as productive as possible of its great end and aim—the edification and holiness of the people."

Mark the hope which is entertained. How the reading of this document will strengthen, &c. ; how it will produce the edification and holiness of the people to preach in a surplice ; leave out the Collect and Lord's Prayer, and use the Bidding Prayer before sermons, I am too ignorant to say. But Dr. B. hoped so, and a very vain hope it has proved. Mr. Blunt is now a Romish Priest, and his and kindred teaching and practice have disturbed the peace of, and scattered, many a once flourishing parish. I would ask, has not the vanity of such a hope been realized nearer home ?

About the year 1840, a portion of the Church of England projected the Colonial Church Society. In 1845, it appears one of the Secretaries visited Ireland, with the view of laying the claims of this new missionary effort before the members of the Church of Ireland. At this the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* is offended, and condemns the Society and its doings in no very measured terms. This article offers Mr. Bethune an opportunity which it would seem he never lost, again to attack the *London Record*. And yet Dr. Bethune belongs to no party, neither entertains nor advocates any extreme views ! A paper which for nearly thirty years has been the staunch supporter of the Church of England and Ireland, in its Evangelical character, the faithful ally of every effort to spread the Redeemer's kingdom, Mr. Bethune denounces "its principles as schismatical and wicked." Does not Dr. Bethune know that there are thousands of the supporters of the *general* views of that paper—men who would not suffer their attachment to the Church of England and Ireland to be questioned—no, not even by such high authority as the Editor of the *Church* ; and did not Dr. Bethune then intend to pass a censure on them. And yet that gentleman holds no extreme views !

Let me add, that that Society, so strongly condemned by the *Irish Ecc. Gazette*, and, impliedly, by the *Church* newspaper,

is patronised by our Sovereign, our truly venerated Archbishop, besides other Bishops and chief rulers ; and though it repudiates many of the tenets of Dr. Bethune, is, I venture to affirm, doing as much for the best interests of our Church, as any of its opponents. In this Diocese, two or three of this Society's Agents are laboring with acceptance ; whilst the Bishops of Montreal and Halifax, and others of the North American Prelates may be added for aught I know, patronize and support it. Permit me to ask—Does not the spirit, evidenced by the Irish paper, and its Canadian ally, savor more of that of the disciples who said—"Lord, we saw one casting out devils in thy name and we forbade him because he followed not us"—than of the Saviour's, "Forbid him not," &c. &c. Surely the jealousy of those Editors for the Gospel Propagation Society was sadly misplaced, when a coadjutor enters so vast a field of missionary labour as the Colonies of Great Britain. Certainly, these gentlemen are at issue with those Bishops who are availing themselves of its services. But the spirit evidenced by those two periodicals, if it be not the spirit of party, what is it ? John and James were partizans, and spake as such ; and the Editor of the *Church* at that day uttered his veto as a partizan. Yes, forbid that Society which does not coincide in our interpretation of Church Polity and Doctrine ! Let me ask—If such was the attempt of the Rev. A. N. Bethune, armed with the little short-lived power as Editor of a weekly journal, what may Evangelical men expect should the Archdeacon of York ever become Bishop of Kingston ?

I do not blame Dr. Bethune for putting forth these views, since he holds them. But is not the Archdeacon of York drawing too largely on our credulity ? when defying, as he does in his letter of the 6th, "you, Mr. Editor, or Mr. Rogers, or any man to prove that I entertain, &c."

I do not say that Dr. Bethune believes himself to have any sympathy with Romanizing tendencies : but I ask him, respectfully, and I ask your readers to judge for himself and themselves from what he has written, where his sympathies are. The indignation, so apparent in the letter referred to, let me say, is just that expressed by many, who have since proved that they did sympathize with Rome then, by joining her communion. We are but men, even the best of us, and certainly not better men than they to whom the searcher of hearts said—"Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."

May I add, and I do this most respectfully—should not the ex-

perience of the last ten years teach Dr. Bethune the vanity of his former hopes of the great benefit to be derived from principles which he so honored, and lost no opportunity of commending? Who has gained by their advocacy? Has the Church of England? I fearlessly say, no. I ask him who thinks otherwise to prove it from documents. But Rome has gained. Where are the leaders of the Tract movement? Rome will tell you, exultingly, Dr. Pusey, the inconsistent—proved so by his own friends—remains; though he has been silenced from preaching within his own University. Bennet remains; though dismissed from London by the Bishop of the Diocese. Mr. Maskell, the examining Chaplain of the Bishop of Exeter, is gone. Mr. Blunt, whose example and doctrine Mr. Bethune admired, is gone. The Rev. Mr. Gresly is doing Rome's work of division and strife at Brighton—is acting contrary to the expressed wishes of his Diocesan. These and others were the lights which were held forth in the *Church* to enlighten the minds of its numerous readers; these were the examples we were *all* bid to follow—with all the authority which the editorial chair could give—by Mr. Bethune: and can any one wonder that we should be alarmed when this gentleman is put forth as the one best qualified to fill the intended See of Kingston. A majority of our clergy may think so. Dr. Bethune has had the opportunity, of which he has availed himself, of imposing these views on the minds of the younger clergy who were once his pupils: but I should tremble for the Evangelical Church of our Diocese, if a goodly array of names are not found in the opposition.

We may be disappointed in the answer to our prayer: but if need be, let our petition be laid at the feet of the constituted authorities at home. Let us do this as a solemn duty to Christ and his Church. Our suffrages have been asked; let us give them, as we would wish we had given them, when the manner of discharging every trust will be investigated. Let us do this in prayer, remembering that "Christ" is "Head over all things"—all events, all persons, "to his Church," and though it may provoke a smile or a sneer, let us show that we believe that He hears and answers prayer, by entreating him to send us a man after his own heart, to preside over us, to his honor and glory, and to the eternal good of the people committed to his care.

Believe me, sincerely yours,

R. V. ROGERS.

bishop,
mediates
affirm,
any of
ciety's
ops of
n Pre-
port it.
e Irish
sciples
name
of the
ousy of
ly mis-
ionary
se gen-
them-
se two
John
Editor
. Yes,
retation
ch was
he little
at may
rk ever

views,
f York
, as he
Rogers,

ve any
im, re-
elf and
ies are.
let me
proved
er com-
ertainly
said—

the ex-

Letter of "Mentor."

MR. EDITOR,—

I am a subscriber to the *Echo*. In your paper of Thursday the 24th of November, the question is proposed, "Who is to be Bishop of Kingston?"

In answer to the question, it may be replied that the following facts enable us to infer from them, who will be the person fit and qualified for the high and responsible office, and to these facts a subscriber to your paper calls the attention of the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese; and more particularly of that body constituting the Archdeaconry of Kingston.

It is known that the Bishops in England constituting the Committee for establishing Colonial Bishoprics have in their hands the recommendation of the person for Bishop, arising from their providing a fund or income for his support and maintenance. The income being provided, the person recommended to the Prime Minister, and named by him to Her Majesty the Queen, is consequently consecrated to be the Bishop of the contemplated and new Diocese.

It is known that the Committee of Bishops in England have considered it expedient for the interests of the Church in Canada, and its advancement and prosperity, that the extensive Diocese of Toronto should be divided into two Sees, and that the Archdeaconry of Kingston should be constituted into a separate one.

It is known that there is in their hands and at their disposal a limited fund, and that the same will be increased to an amount adequate to the support of the Bishopric.

And it is also known that our Diocesan has concurred in the opinion and expediency of having two distinct and separate Sees, and that the City of Kingston, from its population and the number of the clergy resident therein and in its vicinity, is entitled to that distinction.

The inference, then, from the facts above stated, or conclusion follows, that, from the measures adopted and prosecuted by the Committee of Bishops in England for establishing Colonial Bishoprics, and their ultimate success in providing a fund, that the separate and new Diocese of Kingston will be favored by the appointment of a fit and qualified Clergyman from England, and that the expectation that the appointment would be conferred upon any one of the colonial clergy should

be dismissed from our minds, as any plan proposed and prosecuted for that object would certainly fail of being accomplished.

Should, however, any of the clergy of the Colonial Diocese of Toronto be desirous to have a Bishop selected from among them, it would be expected and required that the salary for his support and maintenance would be provided from a colonial and local fund, or Bishop's fund; and, moreover, that the nomination and choice of the person for that office should meet with the unanimous concurrence of the Clergy. As the present Diocese of Toronto is yearly increasing in extent to the westward, the project entertained by the majority of the Clergy may be carried into effect in the time of the successor of our Diocesan; providing in the meantime a Bishop's Fund for the erection of a second See to the west of the City of Toronto, and constituting London the Seat of the third See.

MENTOR.

Letter of "A Layman."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ECHO.

REV. SIR: I trust that the time has gone by in this Province when Ministers may be thrust upon congregations, or Bishops upon the Church, in opposition to their generally expressed wishes; and especially at the present moment when the right of the Church, as a whole, to legislate and act for itself in matters affecting it as a whole, has been so recently and unanimously asserted by the Synod. What is true in the general as a principle, is true also in the particular; and it is but reasonable that measures, more particularly affecting our portion of the Diocese, should be submitted to the Church in that portion for its consideration, before general action be taken thereon. It is hoped, therefore, that in case a Bishop is to be selected for the new See of Kingston from amongst the Clergy in Canada, or the name of one be transmitted to England by our present Diocesan, for the favorable consideration of the Home authorities of our Church, no steps will be taken without first ascertaining the views of the Clergy and Laity in the Archdeaconry of Kingston as to the fitness of any individual

proposed, or whether they would not, under present circumstances, much prefer a Bishop to be sent from England, chosen by the Committee of Bishops appointed for the selection of Bishops for the Colonial Church.

An under current for some time has been observable in certain quarters, having in view the appointment of Archdeacon Bethune to the Bishopric of Kingston; and I have heard it surmised that one chief object of the late visit of that gentleman to England, was to bring himself prominently before the Church at Home, that in the event of a selection being made from amongst the Clergy of Canada, he at least would have the advantage of being known. Now it is thought prudent to bring his name boldly forward as a candidate, that his supposed claims may receive the apparent sanction of the Church here. No time should be therefore lost by every real friend of the Protestant Church of England in making himself heard on a subject of such great moment to the welfare of our Church, lest silence may be construed into approval.

Being a resident within the Archdeaconry of Kingston, I have heard the generally expressed opinion to be, that the appointment of Dr. Bethune would be highly unpopular both amongst the Clergy and Laity.

We do not want a Bishop to avow and teach the pernicious and Romanizing doctrines of Dr. Pusey—that traitor within the Church; we want not a man who will, in a most unwarrantable manner, press his anti-Protestant and unscriptural views upon Divinity students as a *sine qua non* to their ordination. In this connection it may not be out of place to mention a significant fact, that of the two students driven from the Cobourg Theological Institute by Dr. Bethune into other Dioceses for ordination, one is now an ordained Clergyman in Ireland greatly honored of God in the Reformation there, and the other has received high clerical honors from the hands of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Hitherto we have had peace and quietness under the mild and judicious charge of our highly esteemed and venerable Archdeacon of Kingston; and what, may I ask, is to be expected, if, under Bishop Bethune, the novelty of a white surplice should be uplifted in the Pulpit as a badge or standard of a party, and other novelties introduced where they have not as yet appeared? What if we should have some of the disgraceful scenes which have occurred in England enacted in our midst; of congregations rising *en masse* to

leave the church, or even such as appeared at Toronto, at such exhibitions of clerical folly in the pulpit.

Truly in the present condition of our Church generally, and the precarious position of our Church temporalities in this Province, the feelings of the Laity especially are not to be trifled with; and no action should be taken which would tend to lessen the affections of one member to the Church.

Instead, then, of the Archdeacon of York being the man "of all others the best qualified," he is, of all the clergy in this diocese, the most unfit to preside over the new See of Kingston. Let us have a clergyman from England. Far better that we should have no Bishop at all, and that we should remain as we are, than that Dr. Bethune should be appointed over us.

But one word to the people of God amongst us. Have we made the appointment of a Bishop the subject of earnest and unceasing prayer?—if not, do we intend continuing to fail in this plain duty? How are we to expect faithful and spiritual men to be placed over us if we ask not for them? Are not the promises of God abundant? Let us then plead them in faith, and, Israel-like, let us wrestle with God in fervent effectual prayer, till He arise and have mercy upon us. The prayer of a righteous man availeth much, and true it is that a praying congregation will not be long without a praying Minister, and a praying Church will surely have a faithful Bishop.

I am, Rev. Sir,

Yours, &c.,

A LAYMAN.

Letter of "Sciaticus."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ECHO.

DEAR SIR: I think that the thanks of the Clergy are due to you for your honest and *open* remarks respecting the appointment of Dr. Bethune to the Bishopric of Kingston. It is a matter of reprobation that the *Church* paper should refuse to receive any communication on the subject. I deny most emphatically its assertion that the sending of a private circular to any member of the Clergy ought to be considered in the light of a private letter. If the appointment of a Bishop for

any section of the Diocese is to be a matter of representation of opinion to the Imperial Parliament, and a public *canvass* is proposed in behalf of a certain party, far, very far from being a *popular* one, then I exclaim, in the name of justice, *audi alteram partem*. If Dr. Bethune, through the mouthpiece of one of his adherents, openly *asks* the Clergy to vote him their Bishop, then let those who will never consent to any such proceeding, *firmly* oppose their opinion, if not by putting forward some Priest who will more decidedly meet their approbation, at least by preparing a counter document, as the Rector of Barrie most properly proposes, to be forwarded likewise to Her Majesty's Government in England. Is Dr. Bethune, or his enthusiastic admirer, Mr. J. Wilson, aware of the *opposition* that they are certain of receiving? Do they *fancy* that this opposition will come only from the *Clergy*; or are they willing to face the more decided veto of the Laity? Not that if the matter was left to the former, would there be the slightest doubt in my mind as to the issue. The *sum* total for the memorial and *against* it, would, I opine, have a very amusing look.

Suffer however the matter to rest until the next meeting of Synod, and then let the "paramount and irresistible claims" be fairly stated to that venerable Body, and see to what extent they will be "gratefully" acknowledged. But till that time, do not let us have any attempt made, at the instigation of the ambitious party, to bias *secretly* the minds of the clergy, or to get the start in the chase after a mitre—*Palmarum qui meruit ferat*.

Mr. Ardagh has mentioned two grounds for not wishing Dr. Bethune for a Bishop, in both of which I cordially concur. Permit me to add a third one. I assert that if such an irresponsible power as the Episcopate be given to a man of Dr. B.'s cast of thought, farewell to anything like a candid expression of opinion. If men were willing, like Mr. Wilson, to endorse *all* the sayings and doings of Dr. Bethune, as irresistible, then perhaps they would be tolerated; but let any individual assume even the appearance of independency of thought, and then would the same *moral* force be put into operation, as was formerly exercised against those students who were compelled "in conscience" to leave an institution whose motto was, "think as I think, or don't think at all." *Poeta nascitur non fit*, may be applied with justice in the question of a Bishop. Can such be predicated of Dr. Bethune? As a

Theologian, Classical Scholar, or writer, can he be compared with several Clergymen in the colony whose names it would perhaps be invidious to mention? Public candor will suggest them to your readers. As a preacher even his most enthusiastic admirers must confess that Dr. Bethune is deficient in originality of thought, and power of conception.

These are some of the reasons why I have ventured to suggest that Mr. Wilson's memorial is liable to meet with a much greater amount of opposition than, perhaps, either he or his advisers anticipated; and why it becomes the party to ponder a little before they push matters to a final issue. And pray let me, in conclusion, ask, who is the gentleman styling himself J. Wilson, who thus *violently* intrudes his opinion upon the Diocese? Is he the Rector of a large and weighty parish? Does his learning command our admiration? or have his talents taught us to bow submissively to his judgment? You, reverend sir, who live closer to the scene of this gentleman's operations, can perhaps yield some information. Until then,

Believe me, yours truly,

SCIATICUS.

Letter of Rev. Mr. Wilson.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ECHO.

SIR: A friend has just placed in my hand a copy of your paper of the 24th instant, in which I find a communication signed "S. B. Ardagh," in reference to a circular addressed by me to some of the leading and most influential clergy of this Diocese, on the subject of the Archdeacon's nomination to the proposed new See of Kingston.

Without noticing the garbled manner in which Mr. Ardagh has thought proper to introduce this circular—which was never addressed directly to himself—to the notice of your readers, I hasten to consider two serious charges, which, in ignorance we must presume, he has thought proper to prefer against the gentleman whose name stands so conspicuously at the head of his communication.

After objecting to the terms of just commendation in which the circular notices the long and faithful services of the Arch-

deacon, giving him claims far beyond any other clergyman in the diocese, to the appointment of the new See, Mr. Ardagh thus proceeds: "Amongst the many qualifications which should distinguish a Bishop, especially at a time when our unhappy divisions are so rife, I shall mention but two, which in my humble judgment should be prominent: 1st, an absence of extreme doctrinal views; and 2d, a character which has been marked, after a lengthened period, by great prudence. Now I conceive that the Archdeacon is deficient in both these points."

Here are two distinct charges alleged against the Archdeacon—the holding extreme doctrinal views, and the want of prudence in the discharge of his public duties. What Mr. Ardagh means by "extreme doctrinal views," he does not exactly say, but leaves us to infer, by referring to a fyle of the *Church* newspaper, without day or date, while under the editorial management of Dr. Bethune, in reference to the opinion therein expressed of Newman, Pusey, and others. I suspect Mr. Ardagh has not read the *Church* paper himself (as it is well known that he always discouraged its circulation), for his accusation is of so vague and indefinite a nature, that it is difficult to deal properly with it. But if he means to insinuate that the Archdeacon's views are identical with the errors of the above-named writers, or that there is the slightest leaning to Romanizing tendencies in his doctrinal views or teaching, then I most solemnly and unequivocally declare that the accusation is as false as it is groundless. The Archdeacon's teaching and preaching have upon all occasions been characterized by great moderation and soundness, and a strict adherence to the great and distinctive doctrines of the Church, as his numerous and well-instructed flock can most abundantly testify.

Mr. Ardagh, to sustain his second charge, viz., "want of prudence," alleges that the Archdeacon, "while Principal of the Theological Institution at Cobourg, by his imprudent zeal in forcing his views upon the students, drove three of them away, who, being promising young men, were well fitted for the ministry of our Church."

May I be permitted, sir, to ask Mr. Ardagh, from what source he obtained his information in regard to this affair? Was it from the *London Record*, or from one of the three promising young men? Does Mr. Ardagh require to be told at this time of day that the story got up for the *Record* was a wicked fabrication? and that it was disproved in the most em-

phatic manner by the students at the institution, with scarcely an exception—coming forward in an address to their respected Principal, to express their unlimited confidence in the soundness and moderation of his public prelections? Does Mr. Ardagh know also, that an aged and respected brother clergyman—the Rev. Samuel Armour—since gone to his rest, and whose views of doctrine were more in unison with those held by Mr. Ardagh than with the Archdeacon's, wrote to the *Record* at that time, disproving in the most distinct and solemn manner the charge brought against the Principal and the institution?

What Mr. Ardagh means by the term "promising," which he applies to the three young men in question, I do not pretend to decide. But this I do know, that *one* of the three—the leader and author of the whole difficulty referred to—was a young man of most fanatical assumption, filled with spiritual pride and puritanical pretensions; much more of a Dissenter than a Churchman, and the subject, as he believed, of one of those sudden and so-called "conversions": he was continually, and in the most pertinacious manner, obtruding his views upon his fellow-students, and endeavoring to shake their confidence in their duly authorized Instructor. And more than this, I have known the same "promising" young man to circulate, in the Parish, tracts of the most objectionable tendency, calculated to undermine the established doctrine of the Church. Sour and morose in his disposition, and with the most slender attainments, and utter ignorance of the doctrines of the Church, he acted in the most captious and querulous manner; and unless his views and opinions have greatly changed since that time, he ought not, in my humble judgment, even yet to have been ordained to "the ministry of our Church."

And how did the Archdeacon act under these trying circumstances? In the kindest and most forbearing manner possible. He endeavored mildly and gently to convince those that were in error; seldom or never speaking in a tone of authority, but preferring to use the language of parental counsel to those placed under his pastoral charge. And I speak most disinterestedly and impartially, when I declare that I have often been astonished at the mildness, and gentleness, and moderation, and christian forbearance, exhibited upon all occasions, and often under great provocation, by the excellent Professor towards the students under his charge. And I hesitate not to declare my settled conviction, that the two qualifications

which Mr. Ardagh says, in his judgment, should distinguish a Bishop, are to be found in a very eminent degree in the Venerable the Archdeacon of York, viz.—*The total absence of all extreme doctrinal views, and great prudence in the discharge of all his public duties.*

Whence then this wanton attack upon a man whose private and public character is above reproach, and whose faithful and untiring labors for the good of the Church, are known and appreciated throughout this extensive Diocese? Mr. Ardagh may rest assured that the friends of the Archdeacon will not suffer their judgment to be warped by the sympathies or partialities of private friendship, and still less by the rancor of party prejudice: and they believe most conscientiously, that in supporting the Archdeacon's nomination to the contemplated See of Kingston, they are humbly subserving the best interests of our Church in that section of the Province. If our future Bishops are to be chosen from among our own body of Clergy, as we believe they ought and hope they may be, then we contend without fear of contradiction that the Archdeacon's claims are immeasurably superior to those of any of his brethren in the Diocese. If Mr. Ardagh or his friends should think otherwise, of course he has a perfect right to entertain a different opinion, and record his vote accordingly; but *he has no right to slander his brother*, or attempt to fasten odium upon his superiors through the medium of a public newspaper.

And now, Mr Editor, a word for you. Why do you persist in admitting continually into your paper articles avowedly hostile and clearly detrimental to the best interests of the Church? When you published Mr Ardagh's communication relative to the Archdeacon, you knew—as *few men could know better*—that the latter gentleman held no such views as are there imputed to him. And had not your judgment been warped, and your eyes blinded, by the prejudice of party, you would have boldly proclaimed the truth. What signifies our professed respect for a brother, if we are yet knowingly instrumental in traducing his character, or misrepresenting his opinions? Why do you suffer your paper to slander your Bishop, thus "speaking evil of dignities"? Your naturally mild and amiable disposition would have caused you to shrink from taking part in fomenting strife and envy, and heartburning, amongst brethren, had you not unhappily embraced those party views of doctrinal teaching, which are calculated to

promote and foster the "unhappy divisions" of which your correspondent takes notice.

Yours, very sincerely,

J. WILSON.

St. George's Parsonage, }
Grafton, Nov. 30, 1853. }

Reply of Rev. Mr. Ardagh.

[FROM THE ECHO.]

We have received a letter from the Rev. S. B. Ardagh, which, although written in self-defence, we had purposed to refrain from publishing, on the grounds stated in the leading article of our last number. But Mr. Wilson having sent his letter to the *Hamilton Gazette*, and part of it having been republished in the *Church*, with the remark, "We are personally cognizant of the strict truth of every statement made by Mr. Wilson," we cannot refuse to let Mr. Ardagh be heard again. Omitting his remarks in reply to Dr. Bethune's charges of "indelacy, impropriety, and want of decency," and several other portions of his letter, (containing matter more fully adverted to by Mr. Rogers,) for the sake of confining the subject within the narrowest compass, we give the remainder; and we sincerely hope that, as far as the Press is concerned, *the matter may be suffered to rest here, for the present.* Of Dr. Bethune Mr. Ardagh goes on to say:—

"I believe that the character of Dr. Bethune in private life is all that his most ardent friends claim for him. In the slight intercourse I have had with Dr. Bethune, he has treated me with courtesy; and I trust that I showed him the respect due to him. But it is with his public character, and as a candidate for a Bishopric, that I *assert my right*, as a Presbyterian of the Diocese, to give my opinion.

"Mr. Wilson states that my charge against Dr. Bethune 'of holding extreme doctrinal views, is of so vague and indefinite a nature that it is difficult to deal properly with it.' Strange, that after referring for proof not only to the general tendency of the *Church* paper under the editorship of Dr. B., but also

to specified articles, he yet speaks of vagueness and indefiniteness. Let Mr. Wilson take down the volumes of the *Church* and just look at the index, and he will be relieved from his perplexity in a very few minutes. But he 'suspects' that I did not read the *Church* paper myself. I not only read it, but brought some of these articles before a clerical meeting, and concluded by moving a resolution, which was put by the Chairman and carried, to the effect that 'the *Church* paper had a Romanizing tendency, and did not express the principles of a Protestant Churchman.' Moreover, this resolution was duly forwarded to Dr. Bethune, but of course was not admitted into the columns of the *Church*.

"Mr. Wilson asks me from what source I got my information as to the three students who were forced out of the Cobourg Institution. I reply, from the best possible source, and not from the *London Record*, the general principles of which paper I approve. But now, in return, I accuse Mr. Wilson of making a charge not only vague and indefinite, but *worse*, in alleging that 'the story got up for the *Record* was a wicked fabrication.' Was the statement in the *Record* a fabrication, viz., that three students had left the Institution?—was it a fabrication, that their so leaving it, was in consequence of being told by Dr. B. if they continued to hold certain views (called Evangelical) they need not expect ordination, and recommended them to seek some other profession; but because the informant of the *Record* had stated *some* circumstances as to the sufferings of those young men which were not correct, then the *whole* was 'a wicked fabrication.'

"I know that an address was got up from the students to Dr. B. on that occasion, but I am aware of one who distinctly refused to sign it, and I heard from the lips of another that he did not sign it until it was sent back to him the *third* time, and then with something like a threat. Of what value is a document got up under such circumstances?

"Now with respect to Mr. Wilson's insinuation as to the three ejected young men conveyed in the question: What I mean by the term 'promising' as applied to them, I shall answer it by facts. One is now a respected Professor in one of our Episcopal Colleges; another is an esteemed Clergyman in this Diocese, and the third is Clerical Secretary to one of our Church Missionary Societies at home.

"I have now, sir, to remark on the evil effects produced by Dr. B.'s conduct in this affair, and the tendencies of his views

from his editorial chair; effects which have been prejudicial to our respected Bishop, our Diocese, and the Church at large. I was deputed in the latter part of 1849 by the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts to advocate the interests of the Society through a large circuit. In many places I met with much opposition and coldness, grounded upon charges of tyranny and illiberality against my Bishop—a refusal to support a Society that alimanted a Diocese and a Collegiate Institution so presided over. Amongst other proofs I was referred to this unfortunate affair at Cobourg, then comparatively recent. I both publicly and privately defended my Bishop from false assertions and accusations, and in my own person have often declared, with perfect truthfulness, that I had been ever dealt with by him with the greatest courtesy and kindness. My explanations were deemed so satisfactory that some associations which had been discontinued were revived under promising circumstances, and pulpits which were refused to me at first were afterwards opened to me for the advocacy of the Society in general, and my own diocese in particular. I also received a handsome contribution to my own parish.

“Mr. Wilson charges me with ‘making a wanton attack—slandering a brother, and casting odium upon my superiors.’ I plead not guilty to these serious imputations. What I have now written is in self-defence, and the Archdeacon may thank his friend for forcing me to bring forward facts to corroborate my opinion as to his fitness for the Episcopal office.

“As to the charges brought against the *Echo*, I leave to you, sir, the easy task of rebutting them. I trust that the *Echo* will ever be conducted in a Christian spirit, but at the same time with a boldness necessary for the dangers that beset our beloved Church. I love peace, but not peace founded on a compromise of principle. The gangrene of semi-Popery has, alas, got into our Church (or, I should say, among the Clergy) and led many over the precipice. Mild remedies are of no use, they have been depended on too long; the patient now requires the actual cautery. I rejoice that the people of England are at last roused, and the *Standard*, *St. James' Chronicle* and other able journals, have, at the eleventh hour, found it necessary to speak the mind of the English people. The Church of England and Ireland shall not be unprotestantized. No one rejoices more than I do that the revived *Church paper* is conducted on more moderate views; but it is too late, after

years of remonstrance, to ask us now to give up the *Ecclio*, to the establishment of which is mainly to be attributed that change. Apologising for occupying so much of your limited space, but is there not a cause?

"I am, Dear Sir,

"Yours faithfully,

"S. B. ARDAGH,

"Rector of Barrie."

*Circular of Rev. Wm. McMurray, D.D., and Answer of
Rev. R. Flood, A.M.*

CIRCULAR.

DUNDAS, Dec. 26, 1853.

REV. AND DEAR SIR: As many of the Clergy of the Diocese seem to be of the opinion that the proposed See of Kingston should be filled by one of their own number, I take the liberty of bespeaking your vote and influence in behalf of the Archdeacon of York, should the appointment be given to us, as a fit and proper candidate for its Episcopate. Will you have the kindness to signify to me your wishes on the subject as early as may be convenient, and oblige,

Reverend and dear sir,

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM McMURRAY.

The Rev. R. FLOOD, A.M.
Delaware.

REPLY.

DELAWARE, C. W.,

January 7, 1854.

REV. AND DEAR SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your Circular of the 26th ult., in which you solicit my vote and influence in behalf of the Archdeacon of York, as a fit and proper candidate to fill the proposed See of Kingston, should the home authorities permit the clergy of this diocese to elect one of their own number to that office.

I cannot return you a mere reply in the negative, without expressing at the same time my entire disapprobation of the line of action adopted by some of the clergy in reference to

this grave subject ; who have, without the slightest authority, commenced canvassing the clergy for their votes—the senior clergy being the last consulted and solicited on the occasion.

Is not this mode of proceeding *in direct opposition to that express decision of the Synod*, and, consequently, *to the mind and judgment of our venerable Diocesan, who presided on the occasion* ? If the appointment rested with the clergy, then I consider that the only legitimate channel of communicating with them on so serious a matter should be through their Diocesan. To such an authority I would freely and fully state my reasons for disapproving of the object of your choice in the Archdeacon as a fit and proper candidate for the intended See of Kingston.

I believe the Archdeacon's private character to be unimpeachable, and therefore have nothing to say on that head but what is commendable.

My grand objection to his elevation to the Episcopate dates as far back as the time when he filled the editorial chair of the *Church*, in which journal appeared from time to time many articles of a Romanizing tendency, especially the editorial that followed Dr. Pusey's Sermon before the University of Oxford, which appeared more laudatory than condemnatory of a discourse for which the preacher was reprov'd and silenced by his University for some time.

I remain, reverend and dear sir,
Yours truly,

RICHARD FLOOD.

Rev. Dr. McMURRAY,
Dundas.

Circular of Rev. W. McMurray, D.D., and Reply of Rev. Chas. C. Brough, A.B., Rector of the Township of London, C.W.

CIRCULAR.

DUNDAS, December 26th, 1853.

REV. AND DEAR SIR : As many of the clergy of the diocese seem to be of the opinion that the proposed See of Kingston should be filled by one of their own number, I take the liberty of bespeaking your vote and influence in behalf of the Archdeacon of York, should the appointment be given to us, as a

fit and proper candidate for its Episcopate. Will you have the kindness to signify to me your wishes on the subject as early as may be convenient, and oblige

Rev. and Dear Sir, yours sincerely,
WILLIAM McMURRAY.

Rev. C. C. BROUGH, A.B.

Rector of St. John's Church, London.

P.S. In the Rev. Mr. Patton's Deanery they are all for the Archdeacon, with one or two exceptions; the result with Mr Grier is also favorable, and with Dr. Strong they will be nearly unanimous. In the Gore District we will have a large majority.
W. McM.

REPLY.

ST. JOHN'S RECTORY, LONDON TOWNSHIP,
December 31st, 1853.

MY DEAR McMURRAY: Your letter of the 26th instant, headed "Circular," and written officially, duly reached me, but I was ill when it arrived, and consequently have been unable to answer it as soon as I should have desired.

I am truly sorry to be obliged to reply to it, or to any communication from a friend, and more particularly a clerical brother, as I am constrained to do in this instance.

You will understand, and I doubt not more fully than I can, the candor that becomes us in all our proceedings, as clergymen; and in a very particular manner, (and more especially in this our day,) as regards the relation in which we stand towards our lay brethren. The subject upon which you write materially affects that position; and the course adopted by some in reference to the matter under agitation, I cannot but regard as the opposite of what is due to the laity, and appears to me to be neither legitimate nor ingenuous. I desire in the present state of the question to view the subject of your letter altogether apart from the Archdeacon of York's priority of pretension or otherwise to the proposed See of Kingston. I wish to entertain towards him personally, and towards the high office which he occupies in the Church, all due respect; but I cannot, notwithstanding these strong impressions, compromise the duty which rests upon me to dissent from all participation in proceedings which appear to me to bear so strikingly the aspect of intrigue.

It is unnecessary for me to enlarge upon the circumstances which in my mind affix to the acts of certain of the clergy

that character. Some of our brethren in the course pursued have been treated with distrust ; others, I am almost tempted to say, have been approached insidiously ; the laity have been overlooked altogether, and the action of the late Synod has been directly contravened. The *Church* paper expressed its counsel—that too has been set at nought ; a concerted plan, and thus conducted, has been in operation for many weeks, and correspondence marked “private and confidential,” or to that effect, has been in circulation amongst a portion of the clergy ; and now, after this lapse of time, and your plans pre-arranged, a circular is addressed to me to “bespeak my vote and influence.” Am I to regard this as done to save appearances ? This the act almost “bespeaks.”

Others in this section of the Province have been dealt with in the same manner. Who, my dear sir, has prompted you to such a course ? From whom has this circular emanated, and whose official have you been ? I must be strangely ignorant of what is passing in the diocese, if you have acted under competent authority, nor can I conceive how you have become committed in transactions characterized by such want of frankness. I sincerely lament that so many ecclesiastics, as your letter represents, have been found to ignore the solemn action of the Church lawfully convened. I entertain, however, the belief that many of my respected brethren have acted without due reflection.

In relation to this whole matter, of such deep interest to us all, I venture to offer my fervent prayer, that whoever in the providence of God shall be elevated to the proposed See, may be a man of faith and of the Holy Ghost, a Scriptural Bishop, an unequivocal Protestant, without tendency towards Tractarian leprosy.

I feel it my duty to inform you that I intend to give publicity to your circular and my answer, and further, I take this opportunity to assure you that I have not hitherto interfered in the matter of the See of Kingston, nor have I directly or indirectly been concerned in one single line that has been written or published on the subject.

I remain, my dear sir,

Yours, very sincerely and faithfully,

CHARLES C. BROUGH.

Reply of Rev. Benjamin Cronyn, A.M., Rector of the Town of London, C.W., to the Circular.

LONDON, C. W., Jan. 9, 1854.

MY DEAR McMURRAY: The terms of friendly intimacy upon which you and I have ever been since our first acquaintance, require that I should give more than a passing reply to your circular of the 26th ult.

I feel myself constrained to give expression to what I think concerning the means which have been adopted to obtain the appointment of the Archdeacon of York to the See of Kingston. It has come to my knowledge that circulars, marked "private," were sent to certain of the clergy in various parts of the Diocese nearly two months ago, asking them to collect *secretly* the names of such of the clergy in their neighborhoods as were in favor of the appointment of the Archdeacon. When the names were thus procured, an address to the Queen and Government at home, praying that he might be appointed, was to be prepared, and the names thus obtained appended to it. I and many others who were supposed not to be favorable to the Archdeacon's appointment to the Episcopal office, were not applied to; the entire matter was studiously kept from our knowledge; our very existence in the diocese was ignored by the originator of the movement, and by some who acted under him. When, however, contrary to their wishes, this secret canvass found its way into the newspapers, and could no longer be kept "private," then, after the lapse of nearly two months, we, amongst whom are some of the oldest clergymen in the diocese, are invited to join in a measure which it was evidently the intention at first to conceal from us! Was this fair towards the clergy? And does it not appear as if it was the intention of those who originated the movement to transmit to the Queen and Government at home a document signed only by a party in the Church as one emanating from the entire body? This proceeding was also kept secret from the laity, just after they had been assembled in Synod by the Bishop, and a pledge had thus been given them that they should be admitted to a participation in all the affairs of the Church. I presume, also, that this secret canvass was carried on without the knowledge of our Diocesan, although his name has been introduced, for I feel assured that he would never be a party to a course which savors so strongly of partizanship,

nor sanction secret proceedings which must result in the disgrace of all concerned.

I feel assured, that it is only your great personal friendship for the Archdeacon which has caused you to overlook the real character of the proceedings in which you have been induced to co-operate; and that when you re-consider the matter, you will see that a Bishop ought not to be thus secretly introduced into the Church; that a large number of the Clergy ought not to be treated with contempt—that an attempt to mislead the Queen and Government at home ought not to be sanctioned—that the existence of a Synod in the Diocese ought not to be thus practically denied, and the rights of the Laity trampled under foot. If a Bishop is to be elected, let there be no canvass, either secret or open, personal or otherwise, for this high and holy office; let not the Episcopate be degraded by being placed on a par with the office of Common Councilman or Member of Parliament. Such proceedings I hold to be quite disreputable. But let the Provisional Committee be addressed upon the subject, in whose hands the question of the division of the Diocese has been left by the unanimous voice of the Synod, and let such measures be adopted by them to collect the votes of the Laity and Clergy as shall not compromise the character of the Church, and bring disgrace upon the Diocese.

You will see, therefore, that were I only to consider the means which have been adopted to secure the appointment of the Archdeacon of York to the See of Kingston, I should be constrained to refuse my co-operation. But as you have asked my vote and influence for him as a "fit and proper candidate" for the Episcopate, I feel that, however unwilling I may be to enter upon a subject, which heretofore I have carefully avoided, you have now laid on me the necessity of stating candidly that I do not agree with you in the estimate you have formed of the Archdeacon's fitness for that office, but that I should regard his appointment as a measure fraught with danger to the Church in this country. Unworthy motives might be ascribed to me were I to pass over this portion of your letter without bestowing upon it that attention to which the subject entitles it.

In the present state of the Church it is of vital importance that a Bishop should be a man of whose attachment to the Protestant principles of the Reformation, no doubt could be entertained. When canvassing the fitness of the Archdeacon

of York for the Episcopate, as we are invited to do by your Circular, we possess this advantage, that he has been for years before the world in a public character as the Editor of the *Church*. We can therefore speak of his opinions, as put forth in that journal, without exposing ourselves to the charge of personality or the accusation of slander. The views advocated in that paper, while under his management, though generally put forward with much caution, can easily be discovered through the obscurity with which an involved style has invested them; and they will be found on examination, to be widely different from the Protestant principles embodied in the Articles of our Church.

I shall not now enter at large upon this subject, as the Rev. Mr. Rogers has done so at some length in his letter lately published in the *Echo*. I shall merely mention one instance, not noticed by him, in which the Editor of the *Church* propounded and labored to maintain principles, which I believe to be at variance with the plain teaching of the United Church of England and Ireland.

In the Editorial article of the 15th Jan., 1847, the Editor thus expressed himself—"But when the Church Universal has recorded its conclusions, and laid down its interpretation of Holy Scriptures so positively that there can be no further obscurity or doubt—in the canons of General Councils, and in the writings of large numbers of primitive Divines, a decision of this kind cannot be set aside, we conceive, without very grave offence. It is authority beyond question; for if it were not authority, the neglect of it would be no sin." And again—"completely satisfies us, that the Spirit of God, to whose inspiration the most contradictory interpretations of Scripture are indifferently ascribed, cannot be the cause of such confusion, but refers us undoubtedly to some authoritative standard of God's own appointment, even the voice of the Catholic Church." Again—"and the natural inference from this fact is, *that the declarations of God's will*, and the interpretations of the Church universal, have been bound together by God himself, *the author of both*, in close and necessary and inseparable alliance."

From these passages, and from the entire article in which they occur, we are able to collect the writer's view on the all-important points, of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation, and the authority of the Church; which is, that the canons of councils, the writings of large numbers of primitive

Divines, and the interpretations of the Church, proceed from the same inspiration as the Word of God, and that the man who neglects them is guilty of sin! I cannot regard the writer of such passages as the above, however much I may admire his zeal and industry, as a fit candidate for the office of Bishop in the United Church of England and Ireland, which everywhere teaches the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation; which solemnly pronounces the decision, that Churches have "erred not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith"; and that "general councils may err, and sometimes have erred in things pertaining unto God; wherefore things ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture" (xix. and xxi. Articles). Could I be induced to embrace these views, I should at once renounce the communion of a Church which instructs all its members, lay and clerical, "to search diligently for the well of life in the New and Old Testaments, and not to run to the stinking puddles of men's tradition, devised by men's imagination for our justification and salvation" (1st Homily).

I could name other articles in which the Editor of the *Church* has shown a decided bias in favor of unprotestant doctrine, such as his remarks upon the Sermon which caused the suspension of Dr. Pusey by the University of Oxford; but I forbear, as the above doctrine concerning Holy Scripture and the authority of the Church has ever been, and still is, the prolific source of all the errors of the Church of Rome, and of all those evils which have of late troubled our Church.

Knowing then that "a Bishop should be blameless, holding fast the faithful word, that he may be able by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers," I cannot agree with you that the Archdeacon of York is "a fit and proper candidate" for the Episcopal office. I must, therefore, decline pledging my vote and influence in his favor.

I remain, my dear McMurray,

Faithfully yours,

BENJ. CRONYN.

P.S. The above has been written for several days, as you will perceive by the date, but having been absent from home, and otherwise very much engaged, I have not had time to forward it before. As I have learned that there are several persons canvassing the Clergy in this part of the Diocese, I think

it advisable to publish this, that all may be aware of the measures which have been adopted, and of the light in which they are viewed by some of their brethren.

Extract from an Article in "The Echo" of Jan. 12, 1854.

That we are not merely doing the work of a party, in our opposition to the means which have been made use of in canvassing with reference to the Kingston Bishopric, appears from the fact that even those who look upon the *Echo* as an affliction and a misfortune to the Church, are not more favorable to the "Circular" proceeding than we are.

Several, to our own knowledge, who agree with the Rev. Adam Townley in other matters, agree with him also most fully in the following paragraph taken from a letter to which the *Church* has given a "prominent position":

"Yea, I am quite willing to confess that in my opinion, Mr. Wilson committed a mistake in sending his circulars; for the threefold reason that the election of a chief overseer of the flock of CHRIST should not be made the subject of a canvass; that so long as the colonies have not the right of electing their bishops formally conceded to them, to attempt to do so is both *premature* and *undignified*; and that until we have ourselves made provision for securing suitable incomes for our bishops, it is *unseemly*, to say the least, to strive to take their appointment out of the hands of those to whose benevolent zeal we shall probably have to be indebted for that boon also, in addition to our past innumerable obligations."

Now, such disclaimer seems absolutely called for on the part of all who desire Synodical self-government, or else they must be content to appear inconsistent and insincere. When can we ever expect to find a better attended meeting, in proportion to our numbers, than that which so solemnly declared itself a Synod at Toronto? An attempt was made to get a declaration from that Synod recommending the filling up of the proposed new Sees from among the clergy resident in them. The resolution, being submitted to a preparatory committee and brought forward by them, was almost unanimously expunged; and now, in the very teeth of this Synodical action, we have Rural Deans canvassing by circulars addressed to the clergy; and

treating the laity with a neglect of their claim to be consulted, which, if not meant to be contemptuous (and this we do not suppose), has certainly the same effect. The Synod, consisting of Bishop, Clergy, and Laity, has taken a certain course; some of the Rural Deans by circulars induce a large number of the clergy to take an opposite course. If this be permitted and sanctioned, what layman will attend the next meeting that is summoned to *play at Synod*?

Memorial of the Laity.

[Circular.]

KINGSTON, December, 1853.

SIR: We enclose for your consideration, and that of the laity of the congregation with which you are connected, the accompanying copy of Memorials, now in course of preparation and signature by some of the Churches in Kingston and vicinity.

When completed, it is intended to send them to be laid before the Church authorities in England, at an early day.

Should any of the laity of the Congregation with which you are associated desire to memorialize in like manner, the Memorials should be written and signed according to the accompanying instructions, and sent to the address of any of the undersigned without delay.

Your obedient servants,

THOMAS ASKEW,
HORATIO YATES,

Churchwardens of St. George's Church in the City of Kingston.

WM. RUDSTON,
NEIL McLEOD,

Churchwardens of St. James' Church in the City of Kingston.

J. MARKS,
JOHN DUNN,

Churchwardens of Barriefield Church, in the immediate vicinity of Kingston.

MEMORIAL.

To Her Most Gracious Majesty, VICTORIA, by the Grace of God
Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, &c. &c.

The Memorial of the undersigned members of the Congregation of ——— Church (in the Archdeaconry of Kingston),
in the Diocese of Toronto, and that part of the Province of

Canada heretofore Upper Canada—humbly and respectfully sheweth :

That your memorialists, your Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, are strongly attached to the Church of their forefathers, the Reformed Church of England and Ireland, of which they are members.

That while their affections and their sympathies extend to and embrace the Parent Church, being resident within the Archdeaconry of Kingston, they feel an especial interest in the welfare of that branch of the Church which has been planted in Canada.

They, therefore, contemplate with sincere gratification the expressed intention of Your Most Gracious Majesty to establish a separate Diocese within the limits of the present Archdeaconry of Kingston, to be called the Diocese of Kingston, having its seat at the city of Kingston, being fully convinced that this important measure must, if judiciously carried out, greatly strengthen and advance the interests and prosperity of the Church in this portion of the rising Province of Canada. They hope that such division may take place at as early a period as possible; and while they most gratefully acknowledge the liberality of the Parent Church, in already providing the nucleus of a fund to secure the payment of the Bishop's salary, they would, with the view of hastening such division, take this opportunity of expressing their willingness to contribute to such a fund to the extent of their ability.

Your memorialists, however, cannot but express their conviction, that much of the expected benefit to be derived from the erection of such new Diocese will depend, under God, on the character and qualifications of the Bishop who may be consecrated to the proposed See.

Whilst they are painfully sensible of the differences of opinion which exist in our Church on points vitally affecting its welfare and usefulness, they are desirous that views consistent with the Articles and Standards of our Church should be held both by the clergy and laity without compromise of principle.

That in the present infant and struggling state of our Church in this Province, the promotion of peace and unanimity of action among its members is essential to its prosperity and development.

That the appointment of a Bishop of extreme or party views to preside over the proposed Diocese would inevitably engender party strife and disunion; while, on the other hand, much

might be done to promote harmony and peace by the Christian and judicious conduct of a Godly evangelical Bishop, moderate in his ecclesiastical views.

That the entire Clergy, including Missionaries, of our Church in Upper Canada does not exceed one hundred and fifty in number; that at the present time, in the opinion of your memorialists, it would be a matter of extreme difficulty, if not impossibility, for the Church here, with any degree of unanimity, to recommend from amongst so small a number of clergy one to fill the proposed See in whom general confidence could be placed, as having the many other qualifications for a Bishop, combined with a freedom from extreme or party views.

That they exceedingly regret to learn that efforts are being made by a small section of the clergy in this Diocese, having in view the suggestion and recommendation of one of the clergy of said Diocese for consecration to the proposed Bishopric.

That your memorialists would desire to remove any erroneous impression which such efforts might possibly make upon the far distant authorities of the Church in England; either that such proceedings have the sanction of the majority of the members of the Church in this Diocese, or that such appointment would give general satisfaction.

Your memorialists, therefore, would most earnestly and respectfully pray that the Incumbent of the Bishopric of Kingston may be selected from amongst the numerous clergy of the Parent Church in England or Ireland, with the hope that, free from local influences and extreme views, the peace, happiness, and prosperity of our beloved Church may, under the blessing of our Adorable Head, be promoted and secured.

And your memorialists, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

CITY OF KINGSTON, CANADA, }
December, 1853. }

NOTE.—Since the above correspondence has been put in press, the Rev. Dr. McMurray has published a letter, stating that he intended the word "private," marked in his Circular, with a view to keep the canvass from the knowledge of Archdeacon Bethune, solely, and that only a short time intervened between his posting his first and second packages of Circulars to the Clergy.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. Statement of the Decision of the Diocesan Assembly, or Synod, in reference to the Bishopric of Kingston.....	3
2. Letter of the Rev. S. B. Ardagh, A.M., Rector of Town of Barrie, C.W.,	4
3. Letter of Rev. R. T. Rogers, Incumbent of St. James' Church, in the City of Kingston, C. W.....	6
4. Letter of the Venerable A. N. Bethune, D.D., Archdeacon of York....	7
5. Reply of Rev. R. V. Rogers.....	8
6. Letter of "Mentor".....	16
7. Letter of "A Layman".....	17
8. Letter of "Sciaticus".....	19
9. Letter of Rev. Mr. Wilson.....	21
10. Reply of Rev. S. B. Ardagh, A.M.....	25
11. Circular of Rev. Wm. McMurray, D.D., and Answer of Rev. R. Flood, A.M.....	28
12. Circular of Rev. Wm. McMurray, D.D., and Reply of the Rev. Charles C. Brough, A.B., Rector of the Township of London, C. W.....	29
13. Reply of Rev. Benjamin Cronyn, A.M., Rector of the Town of London, C. W., to the Circular.....	32
14. Extract from an article in THE ECHO.....	36
15. Memorial of the Laity.....	37

	PAGE
od, in	3
.....	3
C.W.,	4
in the	6
.....	6
rk....	7
.....	8
.....	16
.....	17
.....	19
.....	21
.....	25
Rev. R.	28
.....	28
Charles	29
.....	29
London,	32
.....	32
.....	36
.....	37